

rates in community activities. In order to have high quality family literacy programs, we need to ensure the instruction provided to both adult and child participants is based on sound scientific research on reading. By authorizing research on how adults learn to read as a part of this legislation, we are taking a positive step in this direction.

In addition, the LIFT Act would help raise the quality of family literacy programs by allowing States to use a portion of their Even Start dollars to provide training and technical assistance to Even Start providers. States would provide such training through a grant, contract, or other agreement with an organization experienced in providing quality training and technical assistance to family literacy instructors. States could not, however, reduce the level of service to program participants in order to provide such training and technical assistance.

The LIFT Act would also permit Even Start projects to operate for more than 8 years. I have heard from many projects that they will have difficulty continuing to operate once Federal support for their project is totally eliminated. As such, the LIFT Act would allow projects to receive Federal support for more than 8 years, but would reduce the level of support to 35 percent of the cost of operating the project. States would, however, be able to eliminate funding for any project if it did not meet program goals and State indicators of program quality.

The final change I want to highlight is a provision which would focus additional program dollars on high needs populations. Once funding for the Even Start Family Literacy Program reaches \$250 million, a total of 6 percent of funding would be reserved to serve migrants and Native Americans. These are some of our most vulnerable families and I believe it is most appropriate to use additional funds to serve their needs. At the present time, a total of 5 percent of program dollars are reserved for Even Start projects for migrants and Native Americans.

Mr. Speaker, these are but a few of the highlights of this important legislation. Its enactment will ensure the long-term success of Even Start and other family literacy programs operated with Federal funds by providing for quality improvements. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this legislation.

HONORING UAW LOCAL 599'S 60TH ANNIVERSARY AND THE RECIPIENTS OF THE "WALTER P. REUTHER DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AWARD"

HON. DEBBIE STABENOW

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 4, 1999

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize the 60th anniversary of UAW Local 599 which will be celebrated on November 6, 1999, and the men and women who will receive the "Walter P. Reuther Distinguished Service Award."

The same solidarity that began in 1937 and 44 days later resulted in the first major industry wide contract in the United States is still thriving today. During those 44 days and nights the members of the fledgling UAW and

the Flint community forged an alliance which has endured for the past 60 years. The brothers and sisters of Local 599 continue to give back to the community that played such a pivotal role in their success. Local 599 has collected over \$1 million to help provide community residents with shelter, food, clothing, and medical care. They have coordinated the Marine Toys For Tots program which has given 10,000 children the overwhelming joy and excitement of a Christmas morning surprise for the past 10 years. The list of organizations to which they have given is long and includes the United Way, Easter Seals, American Cancer Society, Good Will, and the Salvation Army.

The "Walter P. Reuther Distinguished Service Award" is being presented to Robert Aidif, David Aiken, Dale Bingley, Dennis Carl, Jesse Collins, Russell W. Cook, Harvey "Whitey" De Groot, Patrick Dolan, Larry Farlin, Maurice "Mo" Felling, Ted Henderson, Ken Mead, Frank Molina, Shirley Prater, Gene Ridley, John D. Rogers, Dale Scanlon, G. Jean Garza-Smith, Robbie Stevens, Nick Vukovich, Jerry Ward, Greg Wheeler, Don Wilson, Tom Worden, and James Yaklin in recognition of 20 years of recorded service in an elective office in the local union. These individuals have served their union brothers and sisters of UAW Local 599 and their communities with unparalleled devotion and perseverance.

I would like to thank the men and women receiving the "Walter P. Reuther Distinguished Service Award" for their contributions and UAW Local 599 for 60 years of solidarity not only within the plant, but throughout the community. The union brothers and sisters of UAW Local 599 epitomize the values that have made our Nation great.

WOMEN'S HEALTH AND CANCER RIGHTS CONFORMING AMENDMENTS OF 1999

HON. SUE W. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 4, 1999

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Women's Health and Cancer Rights Conforming Amendments of 1999. This bill is a technical correction to legislation adopted by Congress last year that ensures reconstructive surgery coverage for all stages of reconstruction, including symmetrical reconstruction, for breast cancer patients.

In the last Congress I introduced H.R. 616, the Women's Health and Cancer Rights Act of 1998. A specific provision of this bill that requires coverage for reconstructive procedures after breast cancer surgery was passed into law in Title IX of the Omnibus Budget Bill. While passage of last year's legislation was a wonderful step forward, a loophole has been identified which seriously weakens the intent of this legislation. The bill I am proposing would correct this flaw by conforming the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to the requirements consistent with the Women's Health and Cancer Rights Act. This change would provide a civil monetary penalty against those health plans who fail to provide coverage for breast reconstruction following mastectomy or other breast cancer surgery.

There is indeed precedence for such a technical correction. Similar corrections were made

to the Internal Revenue Code as part of the Taxpayer's Relief Act of 1997 to ensure compliance to the Mental Health Parity Act of 1996 and the Newborns' and Mothers' Health Protection Act of 1996. The correction I am seeking today is like these and would ensure compliance to the Women's Health and Cancer Rights Act of 1998.

Studies have documented that the fear of losing a breast is a leading reason why women do not participate in early breast cancer detection programs. Now that coverage is guaranteed for reconstructive surgery following breast cancer surgery, it is time to put the teeth in that language and hold health plans accountable for providing that coverage. As we continue this month of Breast Cancer Awareness, let us make this important correction to ensure the best possible support for breast cancer victims.

CONCERN WITH THE NEXT ROUND OF THE WTO AND TRADE LIBERALIZATION

HON. ENI F.H. FALEOMAVAEGA

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 4, 1999

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, the prospect of a "Millennium Round" of trade liberalization is inspiring heated debate both within the United States and the international community. While further liberalization could bring new opportunities for growth, there is much evidence that the costs of free trade have thus far outweighed the benefits for the majority of the world's people.

Mr. Speaker, if the United States is to maintain its commitment to strengthening democracy domestically and abroad, and to improving the quality of life for all its citizens, it is imperative that a thorough review of WTO policies and procedures be undertaken. Too many questions remain about the effects of trade liberalization—as illustrated by our Nation's mixed experience with NAFTA—and the United States should not rush blindly into a new round of WTO negotiations.

On this timely subject, Mr. Speaker, I recommend to our colleagues and the Nation an excellent article authored by Nora Connor, a Research Associate with the highly-regarded Council on Hemispheric Affairs (COHA), which is based in Washington.

WTO FACES INTERNAL DISCORD, PUBLIC OPPOSITION

With the World Trade Organizations ministerial meetings just days away, trade officials are still arguing over the basic agenda for the Seattle event. An October meeting in Lausanne clarified differences among participants, but saw little progress toward resolving them. Though certain items were to be given priority for a possible "Millennium Round" of trade talks, consensus has proven elusive. WTO member countries remain divided on issues such as the impact of the organization on environmental and labor issues, as well as the prioritization of specific agenda items.

In addition, WTO representatives will be facing raucous public opposition to a new round of trade talks. Numerous national and international groups have denounced the effects of previous free trade measures. These groups have planned large-scale protests to coincide with the ministerial, acting on behalf of labor rights, the environment, sustainable development, consumer rights,

women's and children's issues, and the strengthening of democracy.

Trade experts in many nations insist that a broad agenda addressing the liberalization of previously untreated sectors (including services and agriculture) is the only way to ensure that the new round can move forward. Proponents of a broad agenda assert that any delay in trade liberalization would result in missed opportunities for huge gains in global trade and income, and could open the way for protectionist "backsliding." Advocates of further liberalization also insist that the process must move forward if developing countries are to benefit from increased market access, greater consumer choice and increased opportunity to attract foreign investment.

Many anti-WTO protesters preparing to clog the streets of downtown Seattle say they categorically oppose any new round of trade talks. A petition outlining objections to a new round and calling for an exhaustive review of existing WTO agreements has been signed by over seven hundred groups worldwide. The signatories claim that trade liberalization has done little to benefit the world's poor. They also view the WTO as a threat to democracy, insisting that WTO policies have undermined elected governments' ability to prioritize national development, public health and safety issues, as well as interfered with consumer rights. These concerns are attracting widening publicity, and though they have been dismissed as instances of "anxiety" by U.S. Trade representative Charlene Barshefsky, and as "attacks by extremists dedicated to spreading anarchy and defeating capitalism," by Financial Times contributor Guy de Jonquieres, popular opposition to the WTO could prove a significant barrier to further liberalization, particularly as the U.S. presidential race intensifies.

Despite their opponents' accusations to the contrary, free trade advocates insist that they too have the best interests of the world's population at heart. WTO director-general Mike Moore has summed up the position of free trade supporters in saying that "the WTO is about raising living standards . . . if living standards rise, environmental standards rise, families are better off and children normally have a better education." Moore's position is a prime example of the "rising tide lifts all boats" line: what is good for the economy is good for people. Macroeconomic indicators both support and contradict this thesis, depending on one's point of view. In many developing areas, including Latin America, foreign investment is up, and inflation is down. The Financial Times reported last month that global income has grown dramatically as a result of trade liberalization. The rising-tide rationale is also being applied to the next round of negotiations, with experts insisting that the poorest countries also will benefit from the removal of agricultural trade barriers. Yet others suggest that conditions are worsening in the majority of developing regions. In Latin America overall economic growth has been ragged with less than 3% annually, according to the United Nations Commission on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), with some countries showing negative growth, job creation has slowed, and unemployment has remained fairly stable. Perhaps most telling, gaps in income distribution have sharply widened, suggesting that the free-market system contains inherent structural inequalities preventing some "boats" from rising despite general increases in trade, investment, and economic growth.

In addition, WTO policies continue to force developing countries to compete largely on the basis of their only truly competitive advantage: cheap labor. This presents a prob-

lem, as it has historically, in that labor is performed by workers who are also humans with a need to consume. Countries that must lower labor costs as a means to greater efficiency and greater competitiveness must essentially manipulate their populations in the service of "the market." UNCTAD reports that Latin American workers experienced declines in real wages of 20-30% since the Uruguay Round was implemented beginning in 1990. It seems clear that all workers have not benefited from new trade patterns. Perversely, however, shrinking wages can contribute to the appearance of economic growth in the form of increased "efficiency." Similarly, the rapid increase of temporary and ill-paid service jobs in countries like the U.S. is hailed as improved flexibility in the labor market—even though it may undermine job security for countless workers, and even though significant decreases in wages can adversely affect consumption.

Traditionally, the WTO has argued that labor and environmental matters—as well as the burden of ensuring equitable distribution of resources and profits—are best left to natural forces in member states, as they are not, classically speaking, trade-related. Yet the trade organization consistently has undermined member nations' attempts to regulate labor and environmental protection, with its dispute panel by categorizing many reforms as "non-tariff barriers to trade," which may invite retaliatory sanctions. Issues that might be most effectively pursued by means of international cooperation, are instead reduced to bargaining chips. Developing countries, for example, suffer from environmental degradation just as developed countries do—sometimes even disproportionately, due to, for example, having to allow toxic materials to be dumped or incinerated in third-world countries, out of financial desperation. Yet efforts to enact environmental protection measures are often misguidedly opposed by poorer nations which cannot afford to implement similar measures, or lack the infrastructure to do so. Poorer countries perhaps naively believe that developed countries invoke stricter environmental measures as a ploy to protect their own domestic industries against overseas low cost competition. Labor issues have met a similar fate under free trade, with workers in neighboring countries often pitted against one another, rather than pooling their leverage in order to raise standards across the board.

Supporters of free trade explain the suffering connected with trade liberalization by insisting that such sectors are experiencing the temporary hardships tied to a certain stage in a process of industrialization or development. Once these nations modernize their industries and stabilize their markets in order to become more competitive, the script reads, living standards will improve. But this attitude belies the supposed concern with the plight of the world's most poverty-stricken, implying that those who are suffering in the "early stages" of a country's development will just have to take one for the team. If the poor must wait for the day when free trade will deliver on all of its promises and bring about real improvements in poverty levels and standards of living, as its proponents claim it can do, it seems reasonable to ask that the WTO pause to assess the impact of its policies on those whose destinies are far from assured.

THE REV. RONALD J. FOWLER

HON. TOM SAWYER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 4, 1999

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, for over 30 years, The Rev. Ronald J. Fowler has served with distinction as the Senior Pastor of the Arlington Church of God in my hometown of Akron, OH. When he assumed that position in January 1969, Ron Fowler knew that he had a difficult act to follow—the 23-year tenure of his father, The Rev. Robert L. Fowler.

Ron Fowler has done his father, his congregation, and our community proud.

Under his leadership, the Arlington Church of God has grown in membership and ministries. This growth has twice necessitated the building of new worship and educational facilities.

But Ron Fowler does more than attend to his congregation and preach the Gospel. Both in his public and private roles, he lives the Gospel, committing himself to meet the ever-growing needs of his congregation and our community.

His dedication and devotion to serving the needs of the community led him to spearhead the establishment of the Independent Living Facilities for Seniors, now known as A.H.O.P.E.S.

His commitment to education resulted in the creation of both the Irma Jones Preschool and Infant Center, and the Arlington Christian Academy. That same commitment was evident as Ron Fowler served on the Akron Board of Education, exercising community-wide education leadership, from 1988 to 1995, including two years as Board President.

But most notably, Ron has been a vocal and forceful advocate and champion of racial reconciliation throughout the community and the nation. For more than 10 years, his mostly African-American church has worked hand-in-hand with The Chapel, a predominantly white church, in the Allies race relations program. That powerful personal resolve was evident for all the Nation to see two years ago when President Clinton held his first Town Hall Meeting on Race in Akron.

In one of his sermons, Ron Fowler spoke of an "unquenchable fire" that shapes lives. "Passion," he said, "is not something we are born with. It is something acquired. Whatever the route by which we acquire it, the fire that burns daily within our bosom reveals much about our character and understanding of what our mission in life is."

There is no question that Ron Fowler has that fire.

He is the living embodiment of his own challenge to "Press on" and "Take hold of the faith that gives all of us tomorrow."

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of our community, let me offer congratulations to Ron and Joyce Fowler and their family on 30 years of service through the Arlington Church of God. They have touched and enriched countless lives in their congregation and throughout our community. We are deeply grateful for their service and for their indelible example to the Nation.